

Dear Mr. Denniston,

*Lytle, Balto Sun*

7/4/85

This is different in form, to a large degree content and in focus from what you may recall. And in refusing to pay the newest order of Judge Smith I'm putting my head on the block. Not to justify a slug, "Man Bites Dog," or even Old Man Bites Dirty Dog but because of the repressive principle involved and what I document, I think thoroughly, official fraud and perjury.

We've overturned the evil precedent of retribution on lawyers but the danger to FOIA still exists. It will be, for practical purposes, no more than a skeleton if this entirely unreported corruption is not overturned.

The new evidence I use in support of this Rule 60b motion was disclosed to another requester in a lawsuit in which the FNI's supervisor in this case also is supervisor. He swore in this litigation that what I'm attaching did not exist and at the same time disclosed it to my friend Mark Allen. He swore also in my case that discovery from me would enable the FBI to prove that it had complied with my request while he had in his possession that of which what I use is only part which told him the exact opposite. (Which he knew anyway, without it.) And he also swore, of the FBI's lawyer alleged, I've forgotten which, that my unique subject-matter expertise was required so they could find anything they'd not provided, and again this new evidence proves that to be false and fraudulent.

If Smith does not agree to reopen and set the judgement aside, I'm asking for a trial, arguing that I have a constitutional right to a trial, particularly because Smith didn't even make a "Finding of Fact."

Despite prior experiences with the Office of Professional Responsibility which tells me they are DJ's whitewashing arm, I'm sending them a copy, too.

Not inappropriately, I must respond by Bastille Day. I'm writing a few letters while my wife retypes what I've written. I'll mail this to you when I mail the court and FBI copies.

Best wishes,